Report	**12.392**
Date	16 August 2012
File	Z/01/04/19

Committee	Civil Defence Emergency Management Joint Committee
Author	Jess Hare, Senior Advisor, Business and Development

Results of CDEM Group Plan Workshops

1. Purpose

To provide the Joint Committee with the results of the CDEM Group Plan Workshops, which were held in August 2012. The results will inform the Joint Committee of the key strategic issues identified by each of the sector groups.

2. Background

The Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 (CDEM Act) requires every CDEM Group to prepare and approve a strategic level document known as the CDEM Group Plan (Group Plan). This obligation is set out in Sections 48-57.

One of the top priorities of the newly established Wellington Region Emergency Management Office (WREMO) is the review of the current Group Plan. To be truly effective, it is important that our key partners are involved in assisting us to determine the strategic issues and areas for future development across each of the four Rs (Reduction, Readiness, Response and Recovery). This involvement has been facilitated through a series of sector based workshops

This report presents the results of the workshops, first by sector, and then collectively as a Group.

3. Format of the workshops

The format of the workshops followed a process that is aligned with the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management (MCDEM) Director's Guidelines - CDEM Group Plan Review. The workshops focused on the 'planning' based components of risk assessment, to ensure the strategic issues could be identified.

Initial workshop discussions focused on the strategic issues across the 4 Rs (Reduction, Readiness, Response and Recovery), as many of the items raised were 'all hazard' or 'multiple hazard' based strategic issues. The workshops then discussed specific hazards (such as earthquakes, local source tsunami and

storms) to ensure strategic issues specific to a hazard were identified and included in the plan (e.g. evacuation planning).

The following workshops we held:

- Lifelines – 2nd August 2012

- Welfare – 6th August 2012

- Emergency Services - 8th August 2012

- Local Authorities (WREMO and CEG Subcommittee) – 9th August 2012

- (Local Authority) Planners – 10th August 2012.

All of the workshops had near complete representation which ensured a diversity of views were represented in the final results. It is very important to note that the results of the workshops are the views of the participants drawn out through the workshop process and not one individual or sector.

4.   Results of the workshop

The results of the workshop are shown both in a table below and in more detail in *Attachment 1*. The table below is an overview of how difficult it is to successfully meet our CDEM obligations within each of the 4Rs, along with how much effort we are currently applying. The areas of interest are where the level of effort is not matching the degree of difficulty (e.g. Group - Response). There can be reasons for the mismatch, such as the priorities have been set elsewhere, or the level of risk has been accepted. However, the most likely reason for the mismatch is that there are some strategic issues that are causing gaps in the delivery of our CDEM obligations.

A summary of issues is identified as *Attachment 1*, and are grouped based on whether the issues is recurring or deemed to have high importance to a given sector. When looking at these issues it is important to note that the workshop process was about **identifying the issues**, not identifying what we are doing well at the moment. The Group aspires to be the best, and to achieve this we needed to look subject ourselves to a high level of scrutiny.

	Reduction		Readiness		Response		Recovery	
	Difficulty	Effort	Difficulty	Effort	Difficulty	Effort	Difficulty	Effort
Lifelines	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	L
Welfare	L	L	H	M	M	M	H	L
Emergency Services	L	M	M	H	H	H	H	L
Local Authorities	H	H	M	M	M	M/L	M	L
Planners	H	H	M	L	M	L	H	L
Group (all combined)	M	M	M/H	M	H	M	H	L

5.   Decisions

As the Joint Committee has responsibility for setting the strategic direction thus guiding the plans and programmes of those involved in the wider CDEM arena, it is the Joint Committee who should determine which of the strategic issues should be addressed in the 2013-2018 CDEM Group Plan.

It is rare that any organisation has sufficient resources to overcome all their strategic challenges in a short timeframe. Accordingly challenges/issues need to be prioritised to focus the efforts of those addressing them.

Members of the Joint Committee are therefore requested to read the report (including *Attachment 1*) and identify those strategic issues considered important, including any not raised by the sector groups. Once the strategic issues have been confirmed, the next phase of the planning process will commence (developing objectives and targets).

6.   Recommendations

That the Joint Committee:

1. **Receive** the report

2. **Determine and prioritise** *the strategic issues to be addressed in the 2013-2018 CDEM Group Plan.*

Report prepared by:

Jess Hare
Senior Advisor
Business and Development

Attachment 1: Key Issues identified during CDEM Group Plan workshops – August 2012

Attachment 1: Key Issues identified during CDEM Group Plan workshops – August 2012

Text	Reoccurring theme
Text	Deemed to have high level of importance to stakeholder group
Text	Remaining issues (not in any of the above categories)

	Reduction	Readiness and Response	Recovery
Lifelines	• **Limited Funding** – Due to limited funding, increasing networks resilience will occur over a much longer term than desired • **Insufficient public education messaging** - Public expectation exceeds the ability of lifeline utilities to build resilience into the various networks. There is a lack of communication to the public to allow them to be appropriately informed. • **Use of scientific information** - Under-utilisation of updated hazard and risk information for asset vulnerability studies.	• **Enhanced coordination** – The coordination of lifeline utilities is currently difficult as many operate in silos both in readiness and response. • **Resourcing issues(for escalation above BAU)** - The ability to successfully plan and respond to BAU disruptions has masked the inability of lifeline organisations to be able to escalate their response in a larger scale emergency (due to lack of organic resource). • **Recognising the independencies** - The interdependencies between each lifeline organisations are not always recognised in response planning • **Insufficient public education messaging** - The expectations of restoration times by the public are inconsistent with the sectors.	• **Resourcing issues** - There is a lack of resources and people for the longer-term recovery efforts (in addition to BAU) • **Uncertainty around recovery** - Technology is ever changing making it difficult to plan for a rebuild at an unknown point in time/situation in the future.
	• **Level of engagement** – There are areas of in-action – Some organisations are not engaging at an appropriate level to allow for effective and coordinated risk reduction • **Resourcing issues** – A lack of resource in the Wairarapa (WELA) to reproduce/compliment the efforts of WELG.	• **Resourcing issues** – A lack of resource in the Wairarapa (WELA) to reproduce/compliment the efforts of WELG • **Use of scientific information** - Planning is not based on the true vulnerability (scientific information) therefore significantly reducing the suitability of the plans.	• **Resourcing issues** – A lack of resource in the Wairarapa (WELA) to reproduce/compliment the efforts of WELG.
	• Variation in practices – There is significant variations in the quality of asset management planning within the region		
Welfare	*None identified*	• **Enhanced coordination** – There is a lack of coordination of welfare agencies, and understanding of roles and responsibilities • **Lack of integrated planning** - Agencies are operating in silos. There is a lack of understanding, interconnection and integration in the planning for events. • **Resourcing issues (for escalation above BAU)** - Ability to escalate outside of a "normal" response. Lack of resources for some to support this for extended periods of time.	• **Lack of integrated planning** – There is a lack of coordination and integrated planning for recovery. This integration also needs to include organisations outside of "traditional welfare" organisations e.g. lifelines • **Resourcing issues** – There is a lack of capacity to run both a response and recovery concurrently – capacity issues • **Uncertainty around recovery** – There is lack of understanding of the role of welfare in recovery and how it fits into the social environment (task group)

	None identified	• **Role of the Welfare Advisory Group (WAG)** – There is a lack of understanding of the function and role of the WAG (both within and externally of the WAG)	• **Role of the Welfare Advisory Group (WAG)** – There is a lack of understanding of the WAG's role in recovery.
	Reduction	**Readiness and Response**	**Recovery**
Welfare cont.	*None identified*	• There is still some lack of understanding of responsibility in regard to legislated requirements • Although there has been an increase, there is still a lack of visibility and it is sometimes difficult to get traction on CDEM issues • Lack of recognition that CDEM is being done as it may be encompassed in BAU (terms).	
Emergency Services	• **Limited funding -** The financial side is difficult as there is competition for every dollar spent • **Community buy-in -** It can be difficult to get the community to "buy into" preventative actions. Particularly those that have to prioritise their household income, the reduction methods are often not a priority • **Insufficient public education messaging -** Getting the message across (communicating the message effectively) – there can often be language and other barriers	• **Enhanced coordination -** There needs to be more clarity around command and control (particularly in an escalating situation) – The clarification of roles and responsibilities and the coordination in response needs to be enhanced • **Lack of integrated planning –** There is insufficient integration when planning – currently planning is assumption vs. integration. Many plans assume organisations can fulfil a role without it being discussed. In some instances the organisation doesn't have the capacity to deliver. Also a lack of socialisation of the plans, meeting notes and decisions made • **Insufficient public education messaging -** Perceived unrealistic expectations from the community about what can be delivered by emergency services • **Resourcing issues for escalation above BAU –** There are questions around the ability to escalate outside of a "normal" response. Lack of resources to support this. • **Recognising the independencies –** As there are many inter-dependencies there needs to be more of a collective approach so that priorities can be changed and coordinated to reflect the changing environment and address the inter-dependencies.	• **Uncertainty around recovery -** It can be difficult to know what the situation will look like and how emergency services may be expected to change the way it operates (if at all) • **Resourcing issues –** There will be a heavy demand on resources for recovery – sustaining staff for long periods can be difficult as agencies also have to return to BAU roles as well as their role in recovery. • **Enhanced community participation –** There is a lack of recognition that the community needs to be involved in recovery planning.
		• **Coordination of public information –** There is a lack of coordination in the delivery of public information across the agencies.	
	• The priorities of the funding agencies often dictate the organisations priorities. These can sometimes be in conflict with regional needs.	• Many meetings and working groups with competing priorities and some overlaps	• Community expectations – it can be difficult to manage these expectations through the process. • Variations in BCP - Differing level of BCP across agencies

	Reduction	Readiness and Response	Recovery
Local Authorities	• **Limited funding** - There is competition for every dollar spent across the different services/ competing needs for the same money • **Community buy-in** – It can be difficult to influence the change required (within community). We can only advocate for the change – not always able to enforce it • **Insufficient public education messaging** – There is a need to educate public on reduction measures and risk, not just readiness • **Lack of scientific information** –There is a lack of scientific information regarding community risk for incorporation on LIM. • **Use of scientific information** – There is a need to have agreement across region around validation of information used.	• **Lack of integrated planning** – There is a need to improve the integrated planning within business units and also across the region. This includes at the review process of previous plans. Often we focus on new areas of work, however we need to ensure the previous areas are still relevant and also enhanced through the review process • **Community buy-in (similar to public education)** - There is general apathy towards preparedness – lack of priority for CDEM within community, acceptance and complacency	• **Uncertainty around recovery** – The uncertainty around the consequences makes it difficult to plan. Therefore we need to have principle based planning. Look to WREMO for the framework. • **Uncertainty around recovery** – There is a lack of understanding of what recovery actually looks like as it hasn't been defined. Need to develop a clear picture of what recovery involves and what we need to do to plan for it • **Enhanced community participation** – We need to recognise that the community must be included in recovery planning. • **Lack of integrated planning** – There is a need for joint planning on recovery issues and integration and coordination.
	Reduction	**Readiness and Response**	**Recovery**
Local Authorities cont.		• **Developing community partnerships** – There is a need to integrate CDEM into the community – Develop partnerships with other business units and organisations, and to inter-connect better • **Enhanced community participation** – There is a need to incorporate the community response into the structured CDEM response. Need to recognise that the community response will happen outside of traditional CDEM • **Enhanced community participation** - Lack of capacity (champions) within the community to promote CDEM • **Resourcing issues** - Huge resource require to implement EMIS effectively • **Resourcing issues** - Resources are varied across the region (particularly Wairarapa). Need to ensure consistent delivery of CDEM across the region • **Profile of CDEM** – There is a view within the LAs that CDEM is voluntary rather than a required function. Lack of profile within LAs.	• **Appropriate appointments** - Capacity and capability of Recovery Managers. Ensure the right people are doing the job.
	• Community pressure not to have information on the LIMs because of perceived loss of value. • Length of time for legislation changed for reduction measures – too long.	• Recognise that there has been a reconfiguration, and therefore a need to have a region wide view – how will we operate, as there is now an expectation there will be an enhanced level of service and expectation. • View within the LAs that CDEM is voluntary rather than a required function. Lack of profile within LAs • The expectation continually increases from the community that CDEM will deliver a certain level of service vs. CDEM's increased expectation of what the community will deliver in an emergency.	

	Reduction	Readiness and Response	Recovery
Planners	• **Insufficient public education messaging –** Communication to the public about the consequences of the risks is insufficient. More communication may help with any plans changes that are made as people are more aware • **Use of scientific information –** There are questions around where the 'science' is coming from (variety used by Councils) – there needs to be more collaboration and a higher level of cohesiveness • **Lack of scientific information –** There is an absence of information – the cost to get this information is very high and budgets constraints mean there is a need to prioritise.	• **Lack of integrated planning** - There is a lack of integration when planning – many plans that involve land use are not discussed with the appropriate local authority planners.	• **Uncertainty around recovery –** There is uncertainty around the effects which makes it very difficult to plan for the unknown. Planning needs to be principle based plans. • **Lack of integrated planning –** There is a lack of capacity to relocate people if required in some areas (e.g. Lower Hutt has very limited areas for growth let alone relocation). This needs to planned for regionally.
	• **Lack of integrated planning –** There is a disconnect with the information and processes across the Councils • **Sharing of scientific information -** Scientific information and projects are not shared with the sector. Often projects completed and not circulated, or translated for the end users. E.g. It's Our Fault project	• **Flexibility with land use planning –** There is a lack of flexibility in the consent process during an event. There needs to be a way to streamline the process.	• **Flexibility with land use planning –** There needs to be a way streamline the consenting processes during recovery
	Reduction	**Readiness and Response**	**Recovery**
Planners cont.	• **Establishing a region-wide position on risk mitigation –** There needs to be 'defendable levels' consistent across the region (based on scientific information. This includes support from the top down about why changes are being made. This gives planners a level of comfort when having to defend their decisions (in court), but also gives the Council a position of credibility as all are working from the same page		
	• The planning process is heavily restricted because of the potential legal issues. This adversely affects the quality of the outputs and what the planners are trying to achieve in terms of risk reduction.	• The decisions made during the response phase (by CDEM) have the ability to put a large amount of liability onto the Councils following the emergency. There needs to be a way to minimise this risk to the Councils.	• The potential for litigation restricts the process • No recognition that some planning for recovery has been done – just sits in a different part of the council – not labelled as recovery plans • Final resources and issue – if you don't have the $ you can do the jobs.

Group	To be determined by Joint Committee	To be determined by Joint Committee	To be determined by Joint Committee	To be determined by Joint Committee